

6-16-03
PATENT
IBM Docket No. CA9-99-043

REMARKS

The application was filed on 03 April 2000 with sixteen claims. In the first Examiner's Office Action mailed 14 February 2003, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,249,291 B1 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Managing Internet Transactions" to Popp et al. (Popp '291). The Examiner further rejected claims 1-11 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,368,273 B1 entitled "Networked System for Interactive Communication and Remote Monitoring of Individuals" to Brown (Brown '273) in view of U.S. Patent 6,516,353 B1 entitled "System and Method for Interactive EDI Transactions" to Richards (Richards '353).

In response, Applicant amend claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 13, and 16, and cancel claim 2 to represent that the script remains and executes on the server. In amending the claim, Applicant has not added new matter because support for the script remaining and executing on the server is given in the originally filed specification on page 16, lines 10-11 which states, "[f]irst and most important, the script executes on the server and is not downloaded to the client." Applicant amends claims 1 and 12 to represent that different policies of different desktop/containers are contemplated within the claim and thus those user-interface components are downloaded within the unique policy framework of each desktop/container. Again, no new matter has been added because support is given in the originally filed specification on page 14, lines 26-29 which states, "... the invention contemplates that user-interface components can be implemented in different user-interface

PATENT
IBM Docket No. CA9-99-043

environments because the policies are encapsulated in the container/desktop. Thus, a user-interface component can be reused across a wide variety of computing devices." Claims 1, 3-16 are pending.

6-16-03

PATENT
IBM Docket No. CA9-99-043The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Popp '291.

The Examiner asserts that as per claim 12, Popp '291 discloses a method to script user- interface components to create an application which is stored on a server and whose user- interface components are downloaded to a container/desktop of a client. Contrary to the the Examiner's understanding of Popp '291, Popp '291 does not download user-interface components to the container/desktop of the client. Popp '291 teaches a method of managing internet transactions using an application residing on an application server 316 (*see* 316 in Figure 3A) or a web object server (*see* 912 in Figure 9A). Popp '291 refers to components as constructs that can be reused or shared across applications (*see* column 17, line 53 through column 18, line 37) and it is the control object class or controller that provides object cover for the components (*see* column 18, lines 38-61). The control objects can be scripted together in real time or stored. In Figure 9A of Popp '291, the control objects are located on the web object and/or the application server as shown on Figure 9A. In particular, Figures 6A, 6B, and 6C and its associated text at column 18, line 66 through column 20, line 63 describe how the script is used by the application to generate the web pages. No where are the user-interface components downloaded to the desktop/container for execution; the components remain on the application server, and it is the application that does all the event processing, *see* Event Processing, column 25, line 58 through column 31, line 5 of Popp '291. Again, there is no mention of downloading any components to the desktop/container.

PATENT
IBM Docket No. CA9-99-043

Additionally, Popp '291 does not download the user-interface components to the client within the policy framework of a desktop/container unique to the client. Applicant has created an application scripting together tasks and once a client, whether it be a PDA, a cell phone, or another server, establishes a connection with a server and the server then comprehends the policy framework of the particular client, appropriate user-interface components are downloaded to the client in accordance with policy framework of the desktop/container on that client. Note that the policy framework of the desktop/container is much more than the duration of the user-interface component; it also includes computing power of the client, the number of user-interface components that can be viewed concurrently, positioning, resizing, cropping, etc. *See* Applicant's specification at page 14, lines 3-29.

Thus, having distinguished claim 12 from Popp '291, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 12.

Original

PATENT
IBM Docket No. CA9-99-043

6-16-03

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner further rejected claims 1-11 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown '273 in view of Richards '353. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-6, 13, 16 and have canceled claim 2 to particularly point out and distinctly claim that the script executes on the server and that only those user interface components associated with a particular task are downloaded, executed, and closed before the next user-interface components associated with the next task are downloaded, executed, and closed. Thus, a scripted task comprises more than one user interface component and these interface components are downloaded piecemeal, i.e., when needed, but the script still executes on the server.

Brown '273, on the other hand, discloses calling a medical monitoring software application residing on a server from a client and launching the container/desktop of the client to initialize and execute a script of the application. See Brown '272 at column 9, lines 53-55 which states that the "server transmits the assigned script program to the patient's apparatus through communication network" [reference numbers omitted] and again at column 14, lines 12-13. Applicant explains the disadvantages of downloading an entire script to the client in the originally filed specification at page 16, lines 9-11 which states that Applicant's "invention solves the problem of downloading large amounts of executable code to implement the user-interface of an application in several ways. First and most important, the script executes on

PATENT
IBM Docket No. CA9-99-043

the server and is not downloaded to the client.” The Examiner continues and admits that Brown ‘273 does not explicitly disclose the script executing and closing the user-interface components; and the script executing and closing the another user-interface component. The Examiner, however, asserts that the use and advantages for executing such scripts are well known as evidenced by the teachings of Richards ‘353 at column 5, lines 30-36, 40-42. Respectfully, Richards ‘353 at column 5, lines 30-42, teach the process of creating or building and editing a script, not how the script opens and closes sequential user-interface components.

With respect to claims 3 and 4, the Examiner alleges that Brown ‘273 at column 5, lines 57-61 discloses the claimed container/desktop removing the user-interface components from memory within the client when the user-interface component is closed. Respectfully, Brown ‘273 discloses that the client apparatus has nonvolatile EEPROM and a built-in ROM for storing firmware for controlling the operation of the client. Brown ‘273, however, does not disclose removing user interface components as they are closed. Recall that Brown ‘273 downloads the entire script program to the apparatus. Data obtained by the apparatus are stored in the nonvolatile EEPROM, *see* column 6, line 38; Brown ‘273 is silent about what happens to the user interface components; Applicant presumes that the user interface components remain on the apparatus because the apparatus has limited user interface capability, *see* Figures 3, 8, and 9 of Brown ‘273.

PATENT
IBM Docket No. CA9-99-043

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to review the amendments and the remarks and to pass the application to issuance. The Examiner is further invited to telephone the Attorney listed below if she thinks it would expedite the prosecution and the issuance of the patent.

Respectfully Submitted,



Gregory M. Doudnikoff
Attorney for Applicant
32,847

Phone: 919-254-1288
FAX: 919-254-4330
EMAIL: gdoudnik@us.ibm.com